

*The Fullness of a  
Struggle Without  
Adjectives*



from *Canenero*

### **Anticopyright**

**Every text, every picture, every sound that you like is yours.  
Take it and use it as yours without asking permission.**

## TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

This pamphlet is made up of material that appeared in the Italian anarchist paper *Canenero* in the winter of 1996-7. This was about the time when the trial against anarchists that developed from the Marini investigation was beginning. Two of the anarchists charged in this trial, who were already in prison, issued a rather strident communiqué from prison which seemed to be either a proclamation that they were starting a specific anarchist armed organization or a recommendation that anarchists should develop such an organization. The editors of *Canenero* decided to start from the assumption that this was a recommendation intended to open up discussion of the question rather than an actual proclamation of the beginning of such an organization.

To kick off this discussion, they offered their critique of the communiqué and of the idea of a specific armed organization in the article “The Fullness of a Struggle Without Adjectives”. They brought up important questions relating to specialization, the nature of subversion, the limiting of one’s possibilities for rebellion and so on. Unfortunately, as they point out in “A Missing Debate”, this discussion never really got off the ground. Almost all the responses were, as they say, simply statements of position that did not go more deeply into the questions raised by the communiqué and the editors’ critique. Only one long “Letter on Specialization”, by Massimo Passamani actually examined the question more deeply. This is unfortunate for the comrades in Italy, but these texts offer us a chance to open the discussion ourselves, in a situation perhaps a bit less volatile than that in which the editors of *Canenero* tried to open it in 1996.

Anarchists would do well not to deal with the question of armed struggle lightly. While it is clear to me that a revolutionary transformation that would destroy the state and capital is not likely to occur without the use of armed violence, it is equally clear to me that this is not the essence of such a transformation and that the formation of specific armed organizations separated from the rest of the struggle against the ruling order can only act to undermine the subversion of social relationships that is the essence of anarchist revolt. Unfortunately, at least in the US, most anarchists don’t seem to wrestle with this problem very seriously. If on the one hand far too many simply refuse to think about it at all, on the other hand

many others simply cheerlead for all those who have ever picked up a gun in opposition to a particular power as long as they are not from the right wing. Thus, it is possible to discover a fascination with a myriad of leninist, stalinist, maoist and guevarist “people’s armies” among anarchists.\* In my opinion, the critiques of these groups is so obvious that I don’t consider worthwhile to repeat them. It would be much more interesting, from an anarchist perspective, to examine armed groups that had a specifically anti-authoritarian, anti-hierarchical critique, like the Angry Brigade in Great Britain or Revolutionary Action (*Azione Rivoluzionaria/AR*) in Italy.

I feel that the articles printed below provide a basis for beginning a deeper discussion of the questions armed struggle brings up. In particular, those responding to the communiqué make it very clear what the basic foundation for such a discussion must be: the recognition that our methods of fighting against this society need to carry the relationships we desire within them. Only in this way can our struggle be carried out with joy, free of the christian baggage of duty and sacrifice. In my opinion, to be anarchist is to be anti-militarist, and this applies as much to how we might deal with the matter of armed struggle as with a rejection of the state’s wars. It’s not a question of pacifism, which is just the back side of militarism (who has not encountered the militant pacifist with her strident moral demands for sacrifice?), but of the refusal of all specialization and of the creation of a revolt that involves the whole of one’s life and thus cannot be reduced to any role be it squatter, theorist, saboteur, armed militant or any other possible specialty. I hope this pamphlet will provoke deeper discussions of the questions raised that can enhance the practice of each of us, whatever paths our desires and capabilities move us to take.

*Wolfi Landstreicher*  
March 14, 2005

---

\* Perhaps more frightening is the fascination a small number of anarchists have developed for Islamic extremists since the 9-11 attacks.

## **COMMUNIQUÉ FROM PRISON**

On the day that the state-capital in its two-fold capacity of judge-oppressor will officiate its vindictory trial (in the Occorsio hall of the court in Rome on December 10, 1996) against the anarchist movement – an archaic rite of insult and criminalization against the transgressors of bourgeois society – in the attempt to expunge every form of individual or organized revolutionary antagonism combatting the exploitation of the human being, we fearlessly affirm combatant revolutionary action, without unrealistic aphorisms or anathemas we will claim our identity as an armed organization against the state.

In that hall-like place, formal representation of the legitimacy of bourgeois law, we will practice militant anarchist anti-judicialism by abstaining from the farce of the debate of the trial. We will not endorse the mythical “de jure”, judicial doctrine, age-old normative heritage of states that are developed on the age-old usurpations of slavery, torture and the exploitation of other people’s labor, that guarantees defense for those investigated, offering them the judicial tool of reply, a way of guaranteeing the “democratic” form of the prosecuting trial, a sharp, corrupt and deceptive way disguise *a priori* the prejudice against the defendants who don’t appear in court. We will not recognize the judges!

Industrial civilization is the highest of the aspirations of progress to which state-capital society aims. It forces millions of people in the world to give up the ancient indigenous culture of the population in order to embrace the modern culture of the factory. With the great means that the bourgeois capitalist state uses, beyond being functional as the dominant means of production, are powerful organizers of culture, the culture that is summed up in the symbols of the commodity as mediations between production and consumption.

The globalization of exploitation now so extremely normal is intellectual. The cerebral flattening to the preordained schemas of intelligent machines, the homogenization of the cultures of peoples to the new languages of communications and production are the aim of the new imperialist colonialism. Cybernetic universalism, or multimedia communication, is a tool of the systematic and quantitative reorganization of the new world order, in the sectors of the market, of capital, of the institutional order and of the territorial infrastructure, of the repression of antagonists, refractory to the homogenization of the new scientism, intellectual standardizer.

Inspiring ourselves critically with the experiences of the antagonist armed movement of the 1970s and particularly with the anarchist heritage, with struggles for regional independence, stable references for our path of conflict with the state-capital aimed at extinguishing them through insurrectional means, therefore, on the basis of this historical heritage, we allude to constructing a communist society in anarchist production in the anti-legal sense, without courts or prisons, through struggle against every form of government and power that is realized through the efforts of the exploited; an iconoclastic society inspired by free cooperation among people and by free education.

We recognize in this court the fawning role of the servant of the state, in which, living like a courtier off the sweat of the productive labor of workers and peasants, it insures that the exploited populace continues its obsequious service to bourgeois justice.

Every revolutionary action against the state and bourgeois institutions will be claimed as the sign of a beginning and a continuation of a precise antagonistic path, called Combatant Revolutionary Action, for which we will assume all responsibility in front of power.

No claim at all – at least on our part – for actions against the state with the circle A, because this exposes the anarchist movement to continuous provocations, while it is right to form specific groups that assume political responsibility for their actions.

Our combatant path is the formation in the revolutionary sense of a combatant, internationalist, anti-imperialist anarchist organization, in relation with all revolutionary forces that intend to subvert the order of the bourgeois capitalist state in its phase of globalization, in order to introduce ourselves as a unique productive and organizational model for relations between human beings.

To the many-centered and camouflaged conformation of cybernetic-industrial power, we will respond with wide-spread and well-aimed actions to undermine it both on the territory and in the urban space in which the organizational and informational infrastructures of its domination are centered.

Living force to all revolutionary prisoners and to all combatants, for a new free, anarchist and communist anti-authoritarian society.

Let's remember to avenge all the comrades struck by the fire of the repression of the state-capital.

Long live anarchy, long live armed struggle.

*Rome, December 1, 1996*

*Pippo Stasi, Karechin Cricorian (Garagin Gregorian)*

## **THE FULLNESS OF A STRUGGLE WITHOUT ADJECTIVES**

Recently a communiqué from prison was distributed that has probably disturbed quite a few comrades. We are reproducing it here. Though it has the tone of a proclamation and certain statements are ambiguous, it seems to us that we can rule out the idea that we are confronting the announcement of the formation of an anarchist armed organization. This would be illogical for various reasons. For example, because, throughout time, armed groups have been shrewd enough to explain themselves after they have acted, and it doesn't appear to us as if the acronym "Combatant Revolutionary Action" has ever claimed anything. Furthermore, if the comrades who signed the communiqué had, indeed, formed an armed organization, their document would become an explicit self-denunciation before the court, and this even before having initiated hostilities. If such a thing were true, it would make no sense at all.

From this, we deduce that the text should be interpreted as a simple proposal. Unfortunately, the wretched linguistic style in which it was formulated risks provoking misunderstandings and incomprehension that it would be best for everyone to avoid. More simply, we believe that Pippo Stasi and Garagin Gregorian wish to invite the anarchist movement to reflect on the arguments that they set forth, like the necessity for a portion of anarchists to undertake a path of armed struggle and, therefore to create a specific armed struggle. And since these comrades have not hesitated to state what they think, assuming all responsibility, we assume that no one will take it badly if we do the same.

As we have often taken the opportunity to say in the columns of this paper, we are decidedly opposed to all armed organization, including an unlikely anarchist armed organization. Here it is not a question of a mere divergence of views, but of a substantial radical difference that goes well beyond any considerations of expediency or contingency. We are against any armed organization today, as we were yesterday and will be tomorrow. And we confirm that this aversion of ours is not limited to formal disagreement. Not only will we never support an armed organization, but we will oppose it with a harsh critique. We will oppose its formation and spread because

we consider it hostile to us, insofar as it is not capable of generating prospects that we find desirable.

We think that the individual who rises up, the individual who rebels against this world that is too cramped to contain his dreams, has no interest in limiting their possibilities, but in extending them infinitely if possible. Thirsty for freedom, eager for experience, anyone who rebels is in continuous search for new affinities, for new tools with which to express herself, with which to go to the attack on the existent in order to subvert it from the foundations. This is why insurrectional struggle should find its stimulus and energy in our capacity for filling its arsenal with ever new weapons, beyond and against all reductive specialization. The experts in pistols are like the experts in books, or occupations, or whatever else. They are boring because they always and only speak about themselves and their favorite means. Precisely because we do not privilege one tool over any of the others, we love and support numberless actions, carried out through the most varied means, that occur daily against the ruling order and its structures. Because revolt is like poetry: to be such it must be made by all, not by one alone, particularly not an expert.

Now the specific armed organization is the negation of this insurrectionary struggle, the parasite poisoning the blood. Whereas insurrection encourages enjoyment and the realization of what we have at heart, armed organization only promises sacrifice and ideology. Whereas insurrection exalts the possibilities of individuals, armed organization only exalts the techniques of its soldiers. Whereas insurrection considers a gun or a stick of dynamite to be only one of the weapons available to it, the armed organization makes it the only weapon, the only tool to use (“Long live armed struggle”). Whereas insurrection aims to generalize itself and invites everyone to participate in its festival, the armed organization is closed by force of circumstance and – except for its few militants – nothing is left for others to do except to cheer it on. The subversion of life is a vast project that knows no limits, because it aims to disrupt the totality of society. Armed organization is only able to glimpse a marginal aspect of this struggle – the military conflict against the state – and mistakes it for the whole. And even this conflict, even the armed attack against the state, loses any liberatory meaning, any breath of life, when its entire impetus is reduced to the promotion of a program an acronym to spend at the political market.

It is rather in anonymity that all political calculation vanishes, leaving space for the thousands of individual tensions and vibrations, and for the possibility for them to meet, come together and abandon themselves in each other. And of what use are neon signs to those with no commodities to sell. As to the accusation against those actions claimed with a “circle A”, claiming that they expose the whole anarchist movement to police provocation, other anarchists, terrorized by the idea that someone might come knocking at their door. Unfortunately for them and for the comrades who signed the document, a possible acronym will certainly not resolve the situation. At most, instead of suspecting anarchists of having signed an action with a “circle A”, the police will suspect them of being part of a specific group.

It seems to us to be a bit hasty to claim that in the 1970s, the anarchist movement knew specific experiences of the combatant model, since the “Revolutionary Action” (AR) archipelago – to which we assume Stasi and Gregorian are referring – can only be described as “anarchist” at the cost of a huge ideological distortion. In fact, comrades of various origins came together in AR , animated at the beginning by a libertarian and anti-stalinist spirit that defined its experiment for a brief time as anarcho-communist, considered as the summation of the various positions of the comrades. But it has become clear to many anarchists that armed organizations, none of them excluded, contributed to the decline of social subversion in those years. And these critical reflections are not new, but have been expressed by various anarchists on many occasions since the 1970s.

We don’t know what reasons pushed Stasi and Gregorian to distribute this writing. To say it all, their proposal seems out of this world to us, a bit like the rhetoric used for the occasion, that seems to come directly from debates that raged in the 1970s, poisoning the atmosphere. But more than anything else, we don’t like to see comrades accept the ultimatum the power puts forth today (either reformism or armed struggle) allowing themselves to get drawn into the foolish game of upping the ante: since we are accused of belonging to an armed band that doesn’t exist, why not form a real one? Well, this temptation, this attraction toward the one-way mirror of the armed organization, has no grip on us, and we will never tire of criticizing it wherever it manifests itself. Insurrection has desires and reasons that no military logic could ever understand.

## A MISSING DEBATE

Three weeks ago, when we published Garagin Gregorian and Pippo Stasi's communiqué from prison, we thought that it might be able to open an interesting and worthwhile discussion. That document could have generated an endless series of reflection on topics that are always relevant (specialization, specific armed organization, attack, justice) and on others that – having never really disappeared – have returned after many years to shake up our lives (the question of going on the lam, for example). In our opinion, all these topics should be faced in perspective. By this we mean that they should be confronted not just on the basis of the much too obvious logic of "*comrades are grown-up, weaned and choose what to do for themselves*". We've all reached this point, and it seems ridiculous to repeat it. It is not so necessary to say which conception seems to us to be more or less compatible with "anarchist ethics and tradition", but which one seems like it could move in our perspective. An armed band could possibly be organized in a horizontal manner, but what does that have to do with our insurrection? In the article that accompanied the comrades' communiqué, we did nothing more than reassert the basic banalities on the question of armed struggle, the important matters that *Canenero* has always been fond of emphasizing. But so many other questions remain open, questions that need to be raised sooner or later.

An example for all: the police knock at our door with an arrest warrant. In the situation where we manage to give them the slip, what do we do? Take care, this is a serious problem because forced clandestinity should not cause the interruption of our projects. We should make ourselves capable of facing the new situation in a way that makes it possible for us to still attack the ruling order, and to continue to live fully and with passion in all the spaces that, despite everything, we are able to conquer. To do this, clear ideas and useable tools would be of service to us – before the arrest warrants – to makes sure that our life is not reduced to flight. These tools are also the new way for organizing with respect to the new situation, the new way of communicating with struggles in course and with comrades who are not being pursued. Everything with the same perspective of the complete overturning of life, sacrifice and the existent that animated us before we had to go on the lam. And what about this, what could it ever have to do with a specific combatant organi-

zation – even one that is horizontal, but still has acronyms, programs and the limits that follow from this?

In any case, we were wrong. The debate had a hard time getting off the ground and only one contribution to the discussion has reached us up to now [...]. All the rest have been collective communiqûes and the taking of stands [...] that don't deal with the topics in question with sufficient depth. On the contrary, it seems to us that they reveal, at least partially, some common flaws and push us to consider a few things. The first is that it is necessary to know how to read. By this we mean that if someone writes that the specific armed organization, even when it declares itself anarchist, is a structure that we consider our enemy – as we wrote in the last issue – because it prospects utterly opposed to those we hope for, one should not read that those who propose it or practice it are our enemies. If we were to state that the anarcho-syndicalist perspective, for example, is not just extraneous, but also hostile, to us, we are certain that no one would misunderstand our words. No one would think that we intended to wait outside the houses of comrades who share this perspective in order to do them in, or that we would refuse to give our solidarity if they were struck by repression. The thing that touches us is that in their vision there is a place ready for us as well, that we, however, do not want to occupy. And our critique originates from their project of enclosing us in that place and our firm intention not to be enclosed. And these two perspectives, ours and theirs, have everything to gain from a mutual, constant and heated critique, even harsh when necessary. Because only through critique can distances widen or be bridged and the method be found for making the clash of projects that are so different as to be hostile worthwhile.

Knowing how to read also means that when someone writes that an experience like Revolutionary Action (AR) can be described as anarchist only at the cost of a huge distortion, one should not read that there were no anarchist in the AR. There were many anarchists in the AR, but there were also many other respectable comrades who, and this is not our fault, were not anarchists. It is not without reason that we consider the debate about the AR more interesting than that about the Red Brigades or other combatant parties.

And then – to bring up another flaw – if the one who proposes certain perspectives has the misfortune of being in prison, we certainly cannot play the role of Red Cross nurses, accepting anything that comes to us from behind bars with a compliant smile or ap-

plause even when we consider it rubbish. As long as we consider comrades in prison as poor things who we must always consider right so as not to cause them pain, or as heroes who we consider right because prisoners are always right, the problem will be left unresolved, new situations will catch us unprepared yet again and – in turn – the comrades in prison will be left more and more isolated. It would be best to shake the guerrilla war or political myths of medals from our heads – the myths according to which the more time one has been or has to be in prison, the more revolutionary and, thus, the more correct they must be – and reason passionately on our problems, which are also the problems of the imprisoned who have their say as well. This is why *Canenero* dedicates these pages to this topic [...]

Finally, one more thing shines through in some of the statements of position: the concern that *Canenero* should or wants to be the representative paper of “an area”. *Canenero* represents a small piece of the lives of those who publish it. So don’t think ill of us if we don’t consult all (all of who? which area?) before saying what we think about what comes to us, or if we are not so many experts to teach the doctrine, since we want to have nothing to do with doctrines.

—*the editors of Canenero*

## **LETTER ON SPECIALIZATION**

*(Not putting one's destiny into play unless one is willing to play with all of one's possibilities)*

Today I thought about how sad it is to fall into the habit of defining ourselves in terms of one of the many activities in which we realize ourselves, as if that activity alone described the totality of our existence. All this recalls the separations that the state and the economy inflict on our lives much too closely. Take work, for example. The reproduction of the conditions of existence (i.e., the activity of putting out the effort in order to eat, sleep, stay warm, etc.) should be completely one with discussion, play, the continuous transformation of the environment, loving relationships, conflict, in short with the thousands of expressions of our uniqueness. Instead, work has not only become the center of every concern, but confident in its independence, it also imposes its measure on free time, amusement, encounters and reflection. In short, it is presented as the measure of life itself. In fact, since this is their social identity, almost everyone is defined in terms of the job they carry out, i.e., in terms of misery.

I am referring particularly to the repercussions that the fragmentation that power imposes on everyone's lives has on the theory and practice of subversives. For example, take arms. It seems obvious to me that a revolution without arms is impossible, but it is equally clear that arms are not enough. On the contrary, I believe that the more revolutionary a change is, the less armed conflict is its measure. The broader, more conscious and more joyous the transformation is, the greater is the condition of no return that is created in relationship to the past. If subversion is carried into every sphere of existence, the armed defense of one's possibility for destroying becomes completely one with the creation of new relationships and new environments. Then, everyone would be armed. Otherwise, specialists come into being – future bosses and bureaucrats – who “defend” while everyone else demolishes and rebuilds... their own slavery.

This is especially important because it is not “military” defeats that set off the decline and the consequent triumph of the old world, but rather the dying away of autonomous action and enthusiasm that are smothered by the lie of the “harsh necessities of the transition”

(sacrifice before happiness in communism, obedience to power before freedom in anarchy). And historically, the most brutal repression is always played out precisely in this decline, never in the moment of widespread and uncontrollable insurrection. Paradoxically, anarchists should push, arm in hand, so that arms are needed as little as possible and so that they are never separated from the totality of revolt. Then I ask myself what “armed struggle” could ever mean. I understand it when a leninist is speaking about it, since he possesses nothing of revolution except the misery he sets up – the coup d'état, the taking of the Winter Palace. But for an anti-authoritarian? Perhaps, in the face of the general refusal to attack the state and capital, it could have the significance of emphasizing the inoffensiveness of every partial opposition and the illusoriness of a liberation that tries to abolish the ruling order simply by “delegitimizing it”, or self-managing one's elsewhere. It could be. But if there is anything partial, it is precisely the guerrilla mythology, with its entire stock of slogans, ideologies and hierarchical separations. So one is harmless to power, when one accepts going down the paths known to it and, thus, helps to impede all those it does not know. As to illusions, what else can one call the thesis according to which daily life – with its roles, duties and passivity – is criticized through armed organization. I absolutely recall the thesis: the endeavor was to supply a libertarian and non-vanguardist alternative to the stalinist combatant organizations. The results were already written in the methods. As if to attack the state and capital, there would be need for acronyms, boring claims, unreadable communiqués and all the rest. And still we hear talk of “Armed Struggle” and “combatant” organizations. Remembering – in the midst of so much self-interested amnesia – that arms also make up a part of the struggle can only be positive. But what does this mean? That we should no longer publish journals, have debates, publicly call for the elimination of the pope, throw eggs at judges or yogurt at journalists, loot during marches, occupy spaces or blockade the editorial office of whatever newspaper? Or does it mean – exactly as some magistrates dream – that this “level” should be left to some so that others can become specialists of the “attack”? Furthermore, with the intention of sparing the useless involvement of the entire movement for the actions of a few, as if it were not separations that have always prepared the best terrain for repression.

It would be necessary to free the practices of attack from any “combatant” phraseology, in order to cause them to become the real

meeting of all revolts. This is the best way to prevent them from falling into a rut. So much the more so, since the exploited themselves sometimes move to the attack without waiting for instruction from any organization whatsoever. Dissatisfaction arms itself against the terrorist spectacle of power, sometimes feeding the spectacle. And anarchists should not be the one's to disarm it. In order to hide every sign of dissatisfaction, in order to show that no one – except the latest “terrorists” – rebels against democracy, the state tries to invent a clandestine anarchist organization to which it attributes thousands of expressions of revolt – a revolt that goes beyond any gang, armed or not – in order to negate them. This way, it manages silence and social consensus. Precisely because the masters would like to enclose our activities into a military structure, dividing them into different “levels”, it is necessary for us to expand and unite them as much as possible into a revolutionary project that surpasses the armed mythology *through excess*. Each one with her own aptitudes and desires. And more than this, carrying subversion into every sphere of existence. The arm that contains all arms is the will to live with all one's possibilities, immediately.

And what of the thesis according to which it is necessary to take one's responsibility in the face of power by claiming one's actions? It seems clear to me that acronyms ready for sticking on inconvenient individuals make the police happy. So if responsibility is not to be a lie or a pretext for control, it must be individual. Each person is responsible to herself in her actions. The mutual recognition of responsibility only happens on a plane of mutuality. Therefore, there is no responsibility in the face of those who, by exploiting, place themselves against all mutuality. In the face of authority, there is no terrain – political or military conflict – of common recognition, but only hostility. What does it mean, then, to take one's responsibility in the face of power? Could it maybe mean – in perfect leninist observance – being recognized by it as an organization? Here responsibility ends and its collective substitute, the *spectacle* of social war, begins.

The leftist democrat, respectful of the law, is the first one to become infatuated with guerrilla iconography (especially when it is exotic) and once the guerrilla has laid down his arms, he is the first one to return, gradually from the left, to law and democracy. From this point of view, the one who declares the insurrectional perspective closed in its *entire* range, adhering more or less directly to reformism, helps to reinforce the false need for combatant organiza-

tions – reversed projections of political impotence. Leftist militants are even able to use subcommandante Marcos to legitimate their role against right through the game of postponements. For his part, the subcommandante hopes for nothing more than to be able to act democratically for his fatherland.

Leaving behind the more or less modernized leninists, we come to the sphere of anarchists. Even here, among the specialists of debate, many clasped the “Chiapas insurgents” to their hearts, provided that insurrection – this infantile disorder of anarchism – is never talked about from our side... And as long as one takes the due distance from those who continue to talk about it.

Once at the very end of a meeting on self-managed spaces, a friend of mine told me that in the 1970s there was the firm belief that anyone who used a gun, for this reason alone, was right, while now it seems that reason has been transferred lock, stock and barrel to those who occupy spaces. Interchangeable specializations. In itself, occupying spaces is an important method of struggle, which contains the very possibility of all subversion in a nutshell: the determination to reach out a hand and take one's space. This clearly doesn't mean that such a method, by itself, could put an end to the world of constraints and commodities. As always, the ideas and desires of those who apply it make the difference. If anyone in the occupied spaces seeks the guarantee of survival in a slapdash way, she will find it there, just as – by putting the occupation itself into play – she could find the point of departure for his most boundless demands there. The same goes for books, explosives or love affairs. The most important thing is not to place limits – in one direction or the other – borrowed from the ruling criteria (law, the number, the fortune of success).

Personally, I don't know “the insurrectionalists”; I only know individuals who support the necessity of insurrection, each with his own reasons or methods. A necessity, as one of our friends said, determined by the fact that within the present society it is only possible to propose different ways of responding to the existing questions (perhaps with direct democracy, citizens' committees, etc.), whereas with insurrection the questions themselves change.

And if we refuse all specialization, why describe ourselves as “squatters”? Why describe ourselves through one practice alone? Is it maybe because we can speak publicly of this practice, because it can spread further than others and because it implies a collective dimension? Poor criteria, in my opinion. One can also speak pub-

licly of sabotage, as long as there isn't any need to say, "I did this" or "that guy did the other thing", in order to discuss a question. Several people could also carry out an act of sabotage together, but if only one person were to put it into practice, this would not make the action lose its meaning. It seems to me that the question of the capacity for spreading in itself should be a reason for reflection, certainly not a unit of measure. If someone who loves breaking the windows of banks or shopping centers were to say to you, "Hi, I am a vandal," it would make you laugh. It would be equally ridiculous if a subversive described himself as a "writer" because he doesn't disdain publishing some book or article. I have never heard any anarchist present herself as a "saboteur". If I ever heard this, I would think I was meeting a cretin. Furthermore, who has ever critiqued occupation as such? Who has ever said that dynamite is "more revolutionary" than crowbars? Making the struggle in all its form into an indivisible totality – this is the point. I would say this not of the struggle, but of my life. Without "propaganda" and "the arms of critique", "armed struggle" and "the critique of arms", "daily life" and "revolution", "individual" and "organization", "self-management" and "direct action", and away with pigeonholing.

But without specific proposals (labor struggle, the occupation of spaces or something else), how do you create a broader involvement? Proposals are possible, even though it is necessary to agree on what and with whom. But such proposals are either instances of a theoretical critique and a global practice, or they are... accepted proposals.

Nonetheless, not everything is to be destroyed. The possibility of destruction must not be destroyed. This is not wordplay. Destruction is thought, desired, projected and organized. To do this, no useful contribution, whether theoretical or practical, is wasted, no method abandoned. It is certainly not with fine proclamations of subversion that we can go to the assault on the world. This way, one only becomes a retiree of revolt. The possibility of destruction is completely to be invented, and no one can say that that there has been much effort put into doing this. Often with the alibi that he doesn't want to construct anything, someone will go deeply into reasonings, and equally often, she lacks the will to be as open-minded and quick as her ideas, to refuse to remain at the mercy of events. In short, the ability to know how to choose the occasion. "In the heart of the occasion, everything is a weapon for the man whose will is not disarmed."

I say again: everything together or nothing. When one claims to subvert the world only with discussion, or occupations, or books, or arms, one ends up trying to direct assemblies, occupying hovels, writing badly and shooting worse. The fact is that by repeating these banalities that should be the foundation for starting to truly discuss, one becomes boring like the specialists of repetition. The worn-out dialogues change by changing the situation.

*Massimo Passamani*



*Venomous Butterfly Publications*  
**818 SW 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, PMB 1237**  
**Portland, OR 97204**  
**USA**

[acraticus@angrynerds.com](mailto:acraticus@angrynerds.com)



This publication  
was printed by

**Eberhardt Press**  
3527 NE 15<sup>th</sup> #127, Portland, Oregon 97212  
[printing@eberhardtpress.org](mailto:printing@eberhardtpress.org) • [www.eberhardtpress.org](http://www.eberhardtpress.org)  
877-675-5378 (toll free)